



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY vs. PROFESSOR CATTELL

The following documents embody the recent history and the conclusion of an important controversy which has been dealt with in the past by a special committee of the Association, in a report on *Academic Freedom in War Time* in the February-March *Bulletin* of 1918.

THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY
OF NEW YORK

No. 63 Wall Street

John B. Pine, Clerk

New York, October 1, 1917

Professor James McKeen Cattell
Garrison-on-Hudson, N. Y.

My dear Sir:

I am instructed to inform you that at a meeting of the Trustees of Columbia University held on this date, the following resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, That the continuance of the connection of James McKeen Cattell, Ph.D., LL.D. with the University is prejudicial to the welfare of the University, and that the best interests of the University require that his connection with the University shall cease and determine; and further

Resolved, That the appointment of the said James McKeen Cattell as Professor of Psychology in this University be, and the same hereby is, terminated, and that his connection with the University cease and determine forthwith; and the said professorship is hereby declared vacant; and further

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to transmit a copy of the foregoing resolution to the said James McKeen Cattell.

Yours truly,

(Signed)

John B. Pine,
Clerk of the Trustees

EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN WAR TIME (*Bulletin*, February, March, 1918).

In October last a distinguished man of science was summarily dismissed from his professorship in an important university, after a quarter-century of service, upon the charge of "seditious or treasonable acts." The only specific act officially alleged in support of this grave charge was the writing of a letter to certain Congressmen urging them to give their support to a bill then pending, providing that the armies destined for service abroad should be composed exclusively of volunteers, unless the consent of the majority of the people to the contrary policy should be clearly ascertained. It is evident that dismissal upon such a ground involves a disregard of all the essential distinctions upon which the present report has insisted. It was not asserted that the teacher dismissed had been convicted of violation of any law of the United States; or that he had in fact violated any such law; or that he had engaged in propaganda designed to incite others to resist or evade any law in force, or to refuse their voluntary assistance to the government; or, indeed, that he had engaged in public propaganda of any sort. All that was alleged was that he had exercised the right of petition with reference to a question before Congress, upon which no final action had been taken. With his opinion upon this question the members of your committee have personally no sympathy whatever; though, in view of the traditional dislike of conscription among English-speaking peoples, and the slowness with which Great Britain and the British Colonies have been brought to the adoption of compulsory service, it can hardly be deemed surprising that there should have been found in this country some persons who were unwilling to see the voluntary system abandoned. In any case the committee, if it had the power, would assuredly not conceive that it had the right, to forbid a fellow-citizen to exercise his lawful privilege of addressing the members of the national legislature upon a matter of this kind; nor does it appear to the committee that the board of trustees of an educational institution is invested with such a right. It is a grave abuse of the power of dismissal when it is used to deny to members of university faculties the enjoyment of their fundamental constitutional rights as citizens; and an institution in which dismissal is possible upon such a ground as was officially

put forward in this case is one in which adequate guarantees of academic freedom are manifestly lacking. It is in some respects a still graver abuse of power when administrative officers or governing boards attempt by their official declarations publicly to attach the stigma of treasonable or seditious conduct to an individual teacher because of acts of his which are in fact neither treasonable nor seditious.

GARRISON-ON-HUDSON, N. Y.,
March 26, 1918

TO THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Sirs:

I beg to submit to you the following requests:

(1) That the proceedings which resulted in the passage of the resolution removing me from the chair of psychology on October 1, 1917, be reopened, and that, at a hearing before an impartial body and on properly specified charges, I be given opportunity to defend myself against the accusation of "treason," "sedition" and "opposition to the enforcement of the laws of the United States."

(2) That my salary be paid for the present academic year.

(3) That in accordance with the terms of the statutes of the university I be retired from active service on July 1, with the pension due me.

Presentation of the first request has been postponed until the American Association of University Professors had made its report. The association has now investigated the charges, and on a full review of the facts has stated its conclusion in the following words:

It is a grave abuse of the power of dismissal when it is used to deny to members of university faculties the enjoyment of their fundamental constitutional rights as citizens; and an institution in which dismissal is possible upon such ground as was officially put forward in this case is one in which adequate guarantees of academic freedom are manifestly lacking. It is in some respects a still graver abuse of power when administrative officers or governing boards attempt by their official declarations publicly to attach the stigma of treasonable or seditious conduct to an individual teacher because of acts of his which are in fact neither treasonable nor seditious.

When charges are brought against a member of a college or university faculty upon any ground, the proceedings should, as a matter of course, be strictly judicial in character, and should be in accord with the principle of faculty responsibility. In other words, the person accused should be entitled to have the charges against him stated in writing in specific terms, and to have a fair trial on those charges before either the judicial committee of the faculty, or a joint committee composed

of an equal number of professors and trustees, which should render definite findings, stating, in case of a decision adverse to the accused, the precise acts on which the decision is based. The importance of maintaining these procedural safeguards against hasty or unjust action is, if possible, even greater at a time of popular excitement and heightened passions than under normal conditions.

These findings of the American Association of University Professors are in consonance with Anglo-Saxon conceptions of elementary justice. The charges on which I was dismissed after twenty-six years of continuous service as a full professor of Columbia University are exceedingly grave in character and are by law made crimes punishable by the most severe penalties. A proceeding by which a body of men undertake to adjudge a university professor guilty of such heinous crimes without trial and to publish its findings broadcast is revolting to the sense of fairness and of justice. It can not be allowed to stand.

My second request is based on the fact that my tenure of office was at least from year to year, *i. e.*, from July 1 to June 30.

As to my request for retirement on pension on July 1 next, I beg to remind you that I had completed the full period of twenty-five years of service as professor of Columbia University prior to October 1, 1917, and that on the completion of this period my right to the pension provided by the statutes of the university became an accrued and vested right of which I can not be deprived by any subsequent acts on my part or by any resolution of the trustees. In this connection I desire to call your attention to a letter written to me by the president of the university on May 9, 1913, stating that I became entitled to the pension under section 67 of the statutes on July 1, 1913.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

J. McKEEN CATTELL

THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

No. 63 WALL STREET

JOHN B. PINE, *Clerk*

NEW YORK, April 3, 1918

J. McKEEN CATTELL, Esq.

Garrison-on-Hudson

New York

Dear Sir:

I am instructed by the Trustees of Columbia University to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of March 26th, and to inform

you that they decline to comply with each and every of the requests therein contained.

Yours truly,
(Signed) JOHN B. PINE, *Clerk*

GARRISON-ON-HUDSON, N. Y.
September 21, 1921

TO THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
NO. 63 WALL STREET

Sirs:

In reply to my letter of March 26, 1918, you declined to give me an opportunity to defend myself against the charges under which you dismissed me on October 1, 1917, from the chair of psychology in Columbia University that I had held for twenty-six years. I have consequently been compelled to seek a hearing and a verdict through the tribunal that is open to me.

You also refused to pay the salary for the year during which I was serving and the pension that was due in accordance with the terms of the statutes of the university. I now beg to repeat the request that these be paid and to ask you to give careful consideration to a question that is vital to the good name of Columbia University and to the integrity of the academic career.

You will remember that you dismissed me without a hearing on charges of "sedition," "treason" and "opposition to the enforcement of the laws of the United States." The basis for these charges, as you expressly state, was a letter addressed by me to members of the congress (shown by me to no one else) in support of pending legislation exempting from combatant service in Europe conscripts who objected to war. Such legislation, already enacted by the British Parliament, would in my opinion have been in accord with the spirit of our institutions and would have promoted efficiency and morale, both of the overseas army and at home. It is the constitutional privilege of every citizen to petition the congress on behalf of legislation that he believes to be in the interest of the nation; to join in injuring him for exercising this right is a felony under the federal penal code.

You would scarcely have accused me of lack of loyalty, let alone of heinous crimes against the nation, if you had known that more than any one else I was responsible for the organization of the committees of scientific men which under the National Research Council became important factors in the successful prosecution of the war, that I was an active member of the psychology committee whose useful services to the army were based largely on researches carried on by me and by my students, that I had spent most of the week preceding my dismissal in preparing tests for the selection of army aviators. Neither probably did you know that I had assisted my son, a recent Columbia graduate, to enlist as a private in the army to do medical work in France, where he went with the first group of volunteers in May, 1917.

You were, however, aware that in 1910, after my criticism of the Carnegie pension scheme, a resolution proposing to dismiss me was before you. A few months thereafter in order to cause my resignation, President Butler led you to convey from the laboratory of psychology its six rooms for research, built and equipped with funds secured by me, and at the same time to transfer for my own salary the income from the trust fund of \$100,000 that I had obtained "to increase the facilities of the department." You knew that immediately after the publication of my book on "University Control" in 1913, your committee on education informed me that they had resolved to retire me and that you were prevented from doing so only by official protests from the committees of the three graduate faculties and the division of philosophy, psychology and anthropology. You knew also that you had before you from March to October, 1917, a resolution proposing to dismiss me on account of a letter to members of the Faculty Club, in which I had referred to Dr. Butler as "our much climbing and many talented president," and that you postponed your decision because a committee of the university council presented a report strongly urging that no action be taken.

Under these circumstances—and knowing as you did President Butler's need of rehabilitation and the methods that he uses—you should have been particularly careful to examine into the truth of the charges made by him in his letter of Friday, September 28, 1917. You dismissed me on Monday, October 1, and I first learned of this action and of the cruel charges against me from newspaper reports.

According to the Education Law of the State of New York in institutions under the regents an officer can be removed only "on examination and due proof of the truth of a written complaint of any trustee, of misconduct, incapacity or neglect of duty; provided that at least one week's previous notice of the proposed action shall have been given to the accused and to each trustee."

The American Association of University Professors at their meeting in 1917 unanimously adopted a report emphasizing the falseness of the charges and severely censuring your action. The Columbia Alumni Federation refused to pass a resolution endorsing it. The American Association for the Advancement of Science requested me to continue to edit *Science*, the official organ of the association. Without a single exception our leading scientific men and students of education have continued to co-operate with me in the journals that I edit and in other work for the national welfare. You must certainly now realize that the charges that you made against me in 1917 were false and react to injure Columbia University most seriously.

These circumstances are recalled to place your action in correct perspective and to emphasize the injustice of continuing to withhold the pension that I have earned. An accrued pension is, indeed, a legal and a moral right that a professor can not forfeit, even if his subsequent acts are not approved by the president or trustees of the institution whose statutes provide the pension.

President Butler wrote to me on May 9, 1913, that in accordance with the provisions of the statutes of the university, I became entitled to a pension on July 1, 1913, and proposed to retire me on an annuity of \$2,320, which in the event of my death would have been in part continued as a widow's annuity. He stated in his annual report for 1906 that the cost of the pension to the professor, if in middle life, "would be not less than \$1,200 annually." This amount had in effect been withheld from my salary to be paid to me as a pension.

When I accepted the chair of psychology in Columbia University in 1891, I was influenced by the fact that its statutes provided a pension which was not the case at the University of Pennsylvania. On this account and on the agreement that part of my time should be reserved for research, I accepted as full professor the comparatively small salary of \$2,500, which was never increased beyond \$5,000. Though I had seven children to support and educate, I declined to

consider other openings, one with a salary of \$10,000, partly on account of the pension. When a widow's annuity had accrued by the terms of the university's statutes, I relinquished my life insurance. The statutes of the university are a contract in reliance on which I acted and on which the university can not default.

It is unwise, even from the economic standpoint, to refuse to pay the pension that I had earned. You will find that Columbia professors will not be satisfied with their present modest salaries and men will hesitate to accept calls to the university if they know that their pensions may not be paid. If the teachers of the university believe that false charges may be made against a professor without a hearing in order to save paying the pension that he had earned and to discredit his efforts for university reform, how can you hope for the self-sacrifice and loyalty that are essential to the welfare of the university?

If you associated with university teachers you would know the comparisons made everywhere between the administrative methods used at Harvard and at Columbia. Do you realize that during President Butler's administration—beginning with Professor Woodberry and Professor MacDowell whom he drove away—you have lost fifty-four professors of distinction (seventeen others appointed during President Low's administration being now close to the age of retirement) and have added but twenty-three who are now active? Yet in the course of these nineteen years the number of professors has increased threefold. Columbia still has three psychologists and an anthropologist who are members of the National Academy of Sciences, with twelve members (four now retired) in other sciences; Harvard has thirty members. Columbia has one of our leading thousand scientific men for 202 full-time students (1 : 566 for all students), at Harvard the ratio is 1 : 75, at Yale 1 : 105, at Chicago 1 : 116, at Princeton 1 : 91 and at the Johns Hopkins 1 : 37.

It is ungenerous and unfair to withhold the pension. My services to Columbia University are known to you and it is perhaps unbecoming for me to refer to them. But I may venture to recall the fact that while I was head of the three departments of psychology, philosophy and anthropology (psychology and anthropology having been previously non-existent and philosophy very weak) each of them became the strongest in any American university and they were the

only scientific departments in which Columbia held this position. Forty-six of my former students who received the doctorate of philosophy from Columbia became members of the American Psychological Association, as compared with thirty-one from Harvard and fifteen from Yale. I obtained personally for the department of psychology more money than the university ever paid me.

Even the illegality, the unwisdom and the unfairness of your action are not the most serious aspects of the situation. The men of wealth, society leaders and others of the upper classes who direct our educational corporations have their own codes of morals. They may not understand that for the professor or investigator the most debasing of evils is to suffer a compulsion to suppress or to distort the truth as he sees it. My criticisms of the Carnegie pensions and of university administration by a presidential autocracy subject only to uninformed trustees—which were the real grounds for my dismissal—were protests against an economic control that leads to the moral and intellectual enslavement of the teacher.

If a university uses the accrued value of the pensions of its professors as hostages to control their actions, their investigations and their teaching, they are no longer free men. They are under heavy bonds to keep the peace, but it will be the peace of the desert. No man fit to be a university professor will go to a university or will remain in a university that uses a pension system to destroy the foundations of academic freedom on which alone a true university can stand. Those who pay or withhold money to violate the intellectual integrity of university teachers turn a temple into a house of ill-fame.

President Butler once wrote in the *Educational Review*: "Professor Cattell is one of the few men of science now living who can write so as to be easily understood." I have here written as clearly as I can, but you will not fully understand my meaning. You control the lives of university teachers, but your world of Wall Street and Fifth Avenue is remote from their ways. I beg you therefore to ascertain and to follow their judgment in this instance and in all questions concerning the conduct of the university.

I trust that you will be able to make reply within thirty days to the specific request contained in this letter.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

J. MCKEEN CATTELL

GARRISON-ON-HUDSON, N. Y.

October 31, 1921

WM. BARCLAY PARSONS, Esq.

CHAIRMAN OF THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

No. 63 WALL STREET

NEW YORK CITY

Sir:

No reply has been received to the letter that I addressed on September 21 to the Trustees of Columbia University except the offer made to my attorney of record in the libel cases by the clerk of the corporation and its attorney in the suit against it.

He told my attorney that if I would discontinue the three suits for libel and give a complete release from all money claims, he believed that the trustees would at their meeting on October 3 decide to pay the pension that I should have received had I been retired on a pension on October 1, 1917; that they would hand me at once a check for \$10,080, the back payment on the pension, on my signing the release, and that they would thereafter pay the pension at the rate of \$2,520 a year, the widow's annuity to be continued in the event of my death. The cash payment and the cost of the joint annuity that he offered amount to \$42,027.12. He declined, however, to put this offer in writing or to give even one day for consideration, and he insisted that payment of the pension would be "an act of grace" on the part of the trustees.

I could not do other than inform my attorney that while I should be glad to receive the pension that I have earned and that is due by the terms of the statutes of the university, I could not submit to having my future freedom of speech and of action controlled "at the pleasure of the trustees," and that I could not accept a money payment as a substitute for the withdrawal of false and libelous charges.

It is my belief, and I think that it is the opinion of university professors throughout the United States, that I should be reinstated in the chair of psychology. The trustees could then retire me in accordance with the terms of the statutes, and the payment of the pension would be taken over by the Carnegie Foundation when I reach the age of sixty-five. I am willing to accept reinstatement as the best action that can now be taken in reparation for the wrong done

in 1917. If President Butler and the trustees see fit to assume that they then acted in the interest of the university, as they now would act in the interest of the university in reinstating me, that is a matter for their decision.

Unless such reinstatement is made, or the charges are withdrawn, or opportunity is given to review them before an impartial tribunal, the suits for libel will not be discontinued. These suits were not brought for my vindication, which is needless, but in defense of academic freedom and civic liberty. I want no money from Columbia University beyond what I have earned. All damages received will be given for psychological research in order to make up by the work of others for the teaching and research that President Butler and the trustees have made it difficult for me to do.

I trust that assurances will be given that the pension will be paid. Otherwise I shall secure the advice of university professors throughout the country, and if they believe it to be of service to the academic situation I shall bring suit for the pension. I have reason to think that they will share my belief that it will be in the interest of the academic career and of academic freedom to ascertain whether an earned pension is a contract right or a gratuity given at the pleasure of the trustees.

Please let me know what action, if any, the trustees have taken in regard to the pension, and place this letter before them at their approaching meeting.

Respectfully,
(Signed) J. McKEEN CATTELL

GRAND CENTRAL TERMINAL, NEW YORK CITY
February 25, 1922

TO THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK
No. 63 WALL STREET

Sirs:

I received on February 8 a certified copy of the following preambles and resolution adopted by you at your meeting of February 6:

WHEREAS, the services of James McKeen Cattell as a professor in Columbia University terminated on October 1st, 1917, before which time he had completed

twenty-nine years of service as university professor, of which twenty-six had been in Columbia University; and

WHEREAS, since such termination of his services James McKeen Cattell has made claim for the payment to him of a retiring allowance by the University; and

WHEREAS, a controversy having arisen respecting such claim, there has been an adjustment and settlement thereof providing for the payment of a retiring allowance to him on the basis hereinafter set forth;

Now, THEREFORE, in consideration of said adjustment and settlement, and of his said twenty-six years of service in Columbia University, be it

RESOLVED, that James McKeen Cattell be paid a retiring allowance by "The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York" of twenty-five hundred and seventy dollars (\$2570) annually during his life-time and that after his death an allowance of one-half of said amount be continued to his wife during her life-time, should she survive him, said retiring allowance to date from October 1st, 1917, and to be payable in equal monthly installments, the allowance for each of the years ending October 1st, 1918, 1919, 1920 and 1921 to be payable immediately, with interest thereon hereby fixed at the sum of one thousand one hundred forty-two and 40/100 dollars (\$1,142.40).

This resolution, passed in response to my letter of September 21 and drawn in consultation with me, makes payment of the annuity a contractual obligation on your part. With checks amounting to \$12,279.04, it was exchanged for a general release from other pecuniary claims, specifically in the three pending suits for libel.

For four months, as you are aware, I interposed objections to this form of settlement. I have indeed received from the university the money that I had earned, and (with the exception of the balance of my salary due for 1917-18 and my legal expenses) I wanted no other. By requiring payment of the annuity to be put in the form of a contract, I have obviated the worst feature of your offer of October 3, namely, that the retiring allowance would be an act of grace, payable during your pleasure. I trust that my former colleagues will see to it that their pensions, accrued and unaccrued, can not be misused to control their teaching and their conduct.

You have in fact exerted such control in my case by making payment of the annuity dependent on discontinuance of the libel suits. You have used money that was due me in order to secure release from other claims irrelevant to the annuity. The payment of some \$45,000 on condition that the libel suits be discontinued is indeed a practical acknowledgment of the justice of these suits and of the reluctance

of the defendants to face a trial. It is a personal victory for me, but I regard such a transaction as unbecoming to a university, and for that reason I used all possible efforts to have the payment of the annuity dissociated from the settlement of the lawsuits.

It would surely have been better to have paid the retiring allowance because it was due and properly payable from trust funds given to Columbia University and to the Carnegie Foundation, and then, as I proposed, to let me discontinue the suits for libel, on withdrawal of the charges, in so far as they were libelous. To secure a possible defense, President Butler and the other defendants denied under oath that they had made the charges that the report of the American Association of University Professors states that they did make; their partial retraction is on record. To keep his place in party politics, President Butler publicly apologised for remarks concerning the campaign of General Wood, after having been publicly called by him "a fakir" and the utterer of "a lie." Thus there are precedents for you to require, in the interest of Columbia University, a withdrawal of President Butler's false charges against me.

If, however, as I urged, you had reinstated me in the chair of psychology and then retired me (on the ground that I did not act "in subordination to the president," as deans are required to do by the statutes of the university and professors by coercive etiquette), all complications would have been avoided, and a satisfactory solution would have been reached. Mr. Bertrand Russell, who was convicted of one of the political crimes of which President Butler falsely accused me, was dismissed from his lectureship at Cambridge, but was reinstated when the war ended, and similar action has been taken in Germany. In your support of President Butler's methods, you have forfeited the position of Columbia University, not only among the universities of Great Britain and Germany, but also among American universities such as Harvard.

In the suits for libel no money was wanted, nor could I have obtained substantial damages; for while the charges made at the time of my dismissal were false and libelous (presumably also malicious on the part of President Butler), they did me comparatively little injury—even though they led to my case being brought before the Federal Grand Jury and to my house being raided in the night without search warrant by some fifty drunken soldiers.

It is, indeed, almost incredible that President Butler, a committee of the Trustees of Columbia University and the Trustees as a body should have made charges of "sedition," "treason" and "opposition to the enforcement of the laws of the United States" at the period of greatest patriotic fervor and that their charges should have been believed by none. This is literally true among my acquaintance, for of the thousands of scientific men and leaders in education who have been associated with me, not one has changed his attitude toward me, or has failed to continue to co-operate with me in the four journals that I edit, and in other work for science, education and the nation. On the other hand, I have received hundreds of communications from university professors, indicating or expressing the belief that President Butler made false charges in order to secure my dismissal.

This is a situation intolerable for Columbia University and for every one connected with it. For me it is not a matter of great personal concern; indeed it leads to lenience to my faults and to undue appreciation of my merits. I am, however, deeply interested in academic freedom and civic liberty. If Columbia University continues to maintain that it acted properly in dismissing a professor without a hearing because he had addressed a letter to members of the Congress in support of pending legislation, it relinquishes all claim to be regarded as a true university. If its president and trustees persist in charging that it was "treason," "sedition" and "opposition to the enforcement of the laws of the United States" to exercise the fundamental constitutional right of a citizen to petition the government, they seek to exercise a lawless control subversive of democratic institutions.

I beg therefore to repeat with the utmost urgency my request—and this I do primarily in the interest of Columbia University, of the academic situation and of civic rights—that I be reinstated in the chair of psychology, or that the charges made in 1917 be withdrawn, or that a hearing before an impartial tribunal be given on these charges.

At your meeting on March 6, please give careful consideration to the contents of this letter, to the conditions under which my suits for libel were settled, and to all the circumstances of my relations to

President Butler and to Columbia University, and inform me of your decision.

Respectfully,
(Signed) J. McKEEN CATTELL

THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK
No. 63 WALL STREET

JOHN B. PINE, *Clerk*

NEW YORK, March 7th, 1922

J. McKEEN CATTELL, LL.D.
Grand Central Terminal
New York City

Sir:

I am instructed by the Trustees of the University to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of February 25th, and to reply that the Trustees consider that the incident to which you refer was closed by the resolution adopted by them on February 6th, which is quoted in your letter, and your acceptance thereof.

Yours respectfully,
(Signed) JOHN B. PINE, *Clerk*

STATEMENT ATTRIBUTED TO PRESIDENT BUTLER IN THE *New York Times*, FEBRUARY 8, 1922.

"The Trustees of Columbia University have voted to pay to Mr. Cattell the precise amount of the annual retiring allowance, as fixed by the rules of the Carnegie Foundation, that his twenty-six years of service as professor in Columbia justify. When this retiring allowance was offered to Mr. Cattell after twenty-five years of service, he declined it.

"He has since asked for it, and it has been granted. Mr. Cattell has discontinued his various actions against the university, the *Alumni News* and individual Trustees.

The following supplementary material, bearing on the preceding, has been furnished by the Clerk of the Trustees for publication:

May 21, 1913

Professor J. McKeen Cattell,
Garrison-on-Hudson, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

The Committee on Education, in notifying you through the President of their intention to move a resolution providing for your retirement from active service at the close of the present academic year, had in mind a letter which you wrote to the President of the Carnegie Foundation on November 8, 1910, and which you caused to be widely published. In that letter you stated that you regarded the opportunity to retire for length of service in 1913 as "a privilege to which I am entitled and have shaped my plans accordingly." The Committee, in proposing to recommend your retirement at this time, were acting, therefore, in accordance with a previously expressed judgment of your own, and also in accordance with their own conviction that the interests of the University would be promoted by your retirement.

Your letter of May 13, 1913, addressed to the Chairman of the Trustees, confirms the Committee in this latter opinion, but at the personal request of the President of the University and in deference to his wishes, the Committee have decided not to present to the Trustees the resolution providing for your retirement, of which you were notified under date of May 9 last.

Yours truly,

(Signed) G. L. RIVES,
Chairman of the Trustees

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Appointed March 5, 1917, to inquire into the state of teaching in the
University

To the Trustees of Columbia University:

The undersigned, a Special Committee apointed at the meeting of the Trustees held on March 5, 1917, do respectfully report:

The Trustees by their resolution directed your Special Committee to inquire and ascertain whether doctrines which are subversive of, or tend to the violation or disregard of, the Constitution or laws of the United States or of the State of New York, or which tend to encourage a spirit of disloyalty to the Government of the United States, or the principles upon which it is founded, are taught or disseminated by officers of the University; and, generally, to inquire into the state of teaching in the University.

At the same meeting of the Trustees the following resolutions were introduced and referred to this Committee for consideration:

Resolved, That J. McKeen Cattell, Professor of Psychology, be suspended from the service of the University from and after this date during the remainder of the academic year.

Resolved, That the services of J. McKeen Cattell as an officer of instruction in the University be discontinued from and after June 30, 1917, unless his resignation is received prior to that date.

Your Special Committee made a report at the meeting of the Trustees on June 4 last detailing its proceedings, its consultation with the Deans of the several faculties of the University, and the appointment by the University Council of a Committee to co-operate in making the investigations authorized. The Special Committee also reported an apology by Professor Cattell for a communication which he had addressed to members of the Faculty Club, and because of such apology and the recommendation of the Committee of the Council, this Committee recommended that the resolutions regarding him be held for further consideration. The Committee also requested that it be continued, with leave to report at a later date. This report was received by the Trustees and the Committee continued.

On the afternoon of Commencement Day, June 6, 1917, the President of the University, with the assent of the Trustees given at the June meeting of the Trustees, in speaking to the assembled alumni, and through them to the entire University and to the public, stated:

so long as national policies were in debate, we gave complete freedom, as is our wont and as becomes a university, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and freedom of publication to all members of the University who in lawful and decent ways might wish to inform and to guide public policy. Wrongheadedness and folly we might deplore, but we are bound to tolerate. So soon, however, as the nation spoke by the Congress and by the President, declaring that it would volunteer as one man for the protection and defense of civil liberty and self-government, conditions sharply changed. What had been tolerated before became intolerable now. What had been wrongheadedness was now sedition. What had been folly was now treason. In your presence, I speak by authority for the whole University—for my colleagues of the trustees and for my colleagues of the faculties—when I say, with all possible emphasis, that there is and will be no place in Columbia University, either on the rolls of its faculties or on the rolls of its students, for any person who opposes or who counsels opposition to the effective enforcement of the laws of the United States, or who acts, speaks or writes treason. The separation of any such person from Columbia University will be as speedy as the discovery of his offense. This is the University's last and only word of warning to any among us, if such there be, who are not with whole heart and mind and strength committed to fight with us to make the world safe for democracy.

This warning was the final warning of the University to all connected with it in any capacity, from the highest to the lowest, and expressed the unalterable determination of the Trustees that all those connected with Columbia University, either on the rolls of its faculties or on the rolls of its students, must loyally support all laws of the United States, and that any such person who should oppose or counsel opposition to the effective enforcement of the laws of the United

States, or should speak, or write, or commit any act of sedition or treason, would be promptly separated from the University.

It has become the duty of your Committee to report that two persons connected with the University have failed to respect the letter and the spirit of this warning.

On August 23, 1917, and the following days, Professor Cattell, on the letter-head of Columbia University, Division of Philosophy, Psychology and Anthropology, wrote to a number of members of the House of Representatives as follows:

Sir:

I trust that you will support a measure against sending conscripts to fight in Europe against their will. The intent of the constitution and our consistent national policy should not be reversed without the consent of the people. The President and the present Congress were not elected "to send conscripts to Europe."

Please read the enclosed statement.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

J. McK. CATTELL

This was received with indignation by several of the Representatives to whom it was sent, who wrote to the President of the University, one Representative stating to the President:

I do not think that you will approve of this action of this man Cattell in sowing seeds of sedition and treason with the apparent sanction of the institution of which you are the honored head.

And another Representative to whom this letter was sent, in enclosing the letter which he said he had received from "a member of your faculty," said:

Do you and your trustees approve of putting the prestige of your great University back of such views as are expressed in this letter as is done by the use of the University letter-head?

Your Committee report that this action of Professor Cattell was a direct violation of the warning that the President of the University, with the assent of the Trustees, gave to all those connected with the University, and further, by the use of the letter-head of Columbia University, involved the University as affirming the statement made in this letter to Representatives in Congress in opposition to the enforcement of the laws of the United States.

By Section 2 of the Charter of the University the Trustees are authorized to select and appoint by ballot or otherwise such professor or professors, tutor or tutors, to assist the President in the education and government of the students belonging to said college, and such other officer or officers as to the said Trustees shall seem meet, all of whom shall hold their office during the pleasure of the Trustees. Professor Cattell and Professor —— were both appointed to their respective positions during the pleasure of the Trustees.

The President has addressed a letter to your Committee under authority of the provisions of the Statutes, Section 2, Paragraph 2, recommending the immediate dismissal from the service of the corporation of James McKeen Cattell, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Psychology. . . .

In continuance of the earlier consideration of the case of Professor Cattell, your Committee report that on June 18, 1917, seven of the nine members of the

Committee of the University Council—all who could then be reached—joined in a written statement that Professor Cattell's usefulness in the University be ended. On September 24, the entire Committee of the University Council formally recommended that Professor Cattell be retired from active service under the provisions of Section 67 of the Statutes of the University.

In view of all these facts your Committee have unanimously decided to recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, that the continuance of the connection of James McKeen Cattell, Ph.D., LL.D., with the University is prejudicial to the welfare of the University, and that the best interests of the University require that his connection with the University shall cease and determine; and further

Resolved, that the appointment of the said James McKeen Cattell as Professor of Psychology in this University be, and the same hereby is, terminated, and that his connection with the University cease and determine forthwith; and the said professorship is hereby declared vacant; and further.

Resolved, that the Clerk be instructed to transmit a copy of the foregoing resolution to the said James McKeen Cattell. . . .

The Committee also ask to be continued with leave to report at a later date.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE L. INGRAHAM

JOHN B. PINE

FRANCIS S. BANGS

STEPHEN BAKER

October 1, 1917

LETTER OF THE PRESIDENT

To the Committee on Education and to the Special Committee of Inquiry into the State of Teaching in the University:

Acting under authority of the provisions of the Statutes, Section 2, Paragraph 2, I beg to recommend the immediate dismissal from the service of the University of James McKeen Cattell, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Psychology. . . . for public conduct prejudicial to the influence and good name of the University.

The circumstances attending this unusual recommendation are the following:

In speaking to the assembled alumni, and through them to the entire University and to the public, on the afternoon of Commencement Day, June 6 last, I used the following language:

So long as national policies were in debate, we gave complete freedom, as is our wont and as becomes a university, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and freedom of publication to all members of the University who in lawful and decent ways might wish to inform and to guide public policy. Wrongheadedness and folly we might deplore, but we are bound to tolerate. So soon, however, as the nation spoke by the Congress and by the President, declaring that it would volunteer as one man for the protection and defense of civil liberty and self-government, conditions sharply changed. What had been tolerated before became intolerable now. What had been wrongheadedness was now sedition. What had been folly was now treason. In your presence I speak by authority for the whole University—for my colleagues of the trustees and for my colleagues of the faculties—when I say, with all possible emphasis, that there is and will

be no place in Columbia University, either on the rolls of its faculties or on the rolls of its students, for any person who opposes or who counsels opposition to the effective enforcement of the laws of the United States, or who acts, speaks or writes treason. The separation of any such person from Columbia University will be as speedy as the discovery of his offense. This is the University's last and only word of warning to any among us, if such there be, who are not with whole heart and mind and strength committed to fight with us to make the world safe for democracy.

Despite this public warning, Professor Cattell, on or about August 23 last, writing on the official stationery of the Division of Philosophy, Psychology and Anthropology of Columbia University, addressed to several members of the House of Representatives, including Representatives Kahn of California, Dempsey of New York, and Bathrick of Ohio, the following letter:

Sir:

I trust that you will support a measure against sending conscripts to fight in Europe against their will. The intent of the constitution and our consistent national policy should not be reversed without the consent of the people. The President and the present Congress were not elected "to send conscripts to Europe." Please read the enclosed statement.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

J. MCK. CATTELL

The originals of the letters addressed to Representatives Kahn and Dempsey have been placed in my hands by those gentlemen, together with a vigorous protest against this misuse of the name and reputation of Columbia University and against this direct attempt to weaken the effort of the nation to win the greatest and by far the most important war of all history. Numberless protests have been received from past and present members of the University, as well as from citizens generally, and the public press from one end of the country to the other has made Professor Cattell's action the subject of indignant comment and of sarcastic reference to the policies and the influence of Columbia University. Even more direct is the following letter addressed to the President under date of September 19, 1917, by the entire membership of the Committee on Instruction of the Faculty of Applied Science, speaking for all their colleagues on the teaching staff of the Schools of Mines, Engineering and Chemistry:

September 19, 1917

Dear Dr. Butler:

Thousands of Columbia men were greatly pleased and in a sense relieved, when they heard or read the statement in your speech delivered last Commencement, that the separation of any person from Columbia University would be as speedy as the discovery of his offense in opposing or counseling opposition to the government, or who is not with whole heart and mind committed to fight with us to "make the world safe for democracy."

We, the members of the Committee on Instruction of the Schools of Mines, Engineering and Chemistry, representing the Faculty of these Schools, are very much distressed at the discredit which has been brought to the fair name of Columbia University and to those engaged in its service, through the action of Professor J. M. Cattell. The newspaper reports of the activities of these men have occasioned us much embarrassment and lessened the power of our work and our influence in this national crisis.

In our opinion Columbia has been placed before the country in a false position by these men, and loyal members of its staff have been humiliated. For years

to come the opinion in the public mind which these men have created will cause us to suffer.

We are also anxious that our students shall be surrounded by those influences which, while encouraging vigorous independent thought, at the same time develop unquestioned loyalty to our country.

We pray, therefore, for immediate relief and the safeguarding of our name as members of the Faculty of Columbia University.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR L. WALKER
CHARLES E. LUCKE
WALTER RAUTENSTRAUCH
WALTER I. SLICHTER
GEORGE V. WENDELL
RALPH E. MAYER
CHARLES P. BERKEY
DANIEL D. JACKSON

Inasmuch as examples of the original letters written by Professor Cattell have been sent to and examined by me, and inasmuch as he has, on being directly asked the question, admitted writing these letters, his act in so doing comes directly within the scope of my public warning of June 6 last. I therefore recommend that Professor Cattell be peremptorily dismissed from the service of Columbia University. . . .

For a number of years it has been the strongly held opinion of the Trustees that the interests of the University required the dismissal of Professor Cattell from its service. He has been retained upon the rolls only in deference to the wishes of some of his colleagues, who are now among those asking that his period of University service be terminated. . . .

Respectfully,

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER,
President

September 28, 1917.